

AMANDA N. LISKAMM  
Director, Consumer Protection Branch  
MANU J. SEBASTIAN  
Trial Attorney  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Consumer Protection Branch  
450 Fifth Street, NW, Suite 6400S  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 514-0515  
Facsimile: (202) 514-8742  
Email: Manu.J.Sebastian@usdoj.gov

JOSEPH T. MCNALLY  
Acting United States Attorney  
LINDSAY GREER DOTSON  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Chief, Criminal Division  
VALERIE MAKAREWICZ (Cal. Bar No. 229637)  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Major Frauds Section  
1100 United States Courthouse  
312 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012  
Telephone: (213) 894-0756  
Facsimile: (213) 894-6269  
E-mail: Valerie.Makarewicz@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JASON EDWARD THOMAS CARDIFF,  
  
Defendant.

No. 5:23-CR-00021-JGB

**OPPOSITION TO JASON CARDIFF'S EX  
PARTE APPLICATION TO CONTINUE  
HEARING DATE AND PARTICIPATE BY  
VIDEO CONFERENCE**

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel  
of record, the Consumer Protection Branch of the United States  
Department of Justice and Trial Attorney Manu J. Sebastian, and the  
Acting United States Attorney for the Central District of California

1 and Assistant United States Attorney Valerie L. Makarewicz, oppose  
2 the ex parte application. Dkt. 207.

3 In such filing, Defendant initially requests the Court to  
4 continue the hearing on the government's Motion to Forfeit Bail and  
5 Summary Adjudication from March 3, 2025 to March 10, 2025, so it may  
6 be heard with defendant's motion to compel discovery. While the  
7 government is very sensitive to the limited availability of the  
8 Court's schedule to hear motions by parties, defendant is not - as  
9 argued by the government, defendant filed a baseless motion to compel  
10 without citing to any law to support his request for relief.  
11 Defendant's matter is needlessly consuming the Court's limited  
12 resources and should be held without a hearing and instead, taken  
13 under submission as to not waste the Court's time any further.

14 Additionally, Defendant requested that he be permitted to attend  
15 hearings virtually. The government opposes this request from  
16 Defendant for the same reasons as identified in its previous video  
17 conference opposition. Dkt. 184.

18 Defendant is voluntarily absent. Dkt. 196. The Court determined  
19 defendant is a fugitive that is disobeying multiple court orders and  
20 issued a warrant for his arrest. See Dkts. 151, 165, 171, 194-196.  
21 Similar to his last request, Defendant lacks good cause to attend the  
22 motion hearing by video conference or telephone. Dkt. 188. Defendant  
23 should not be permitted to file further frivolous requests, while he  
24 himself refuses to obey the Court's orders.

25 /

26 /

27 /

1 Accordingly, the government requests the Court deny defendant's  
2 ex parte application.

3 Dated: February 25, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

4 AMANDA N. LISKAMM  
5 Director  
6 Consumer Protection Branch

7 JOSEPH T. MCNALLY  
Acting United States Attorney

8 /s/  
9 MANU J. SEBASTIAN  
Trial Attorney  
10 VALERIE L. MAKAREWICZ  
Assistant United States Attorney

11 Attorneys for the Plaintiff  
12 United States of America  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28